DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 411 442 CE 074 768

AUTHOR Lanser, Michael A.
TITLE Development of an Implementation Plan for Assessing Institutional Effectiveness at Lakeshore Technical College.
PUB DATE 1995-12-00
NOTE 73p.; Doctor of Education Practicum Report, Nova Southeastern University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Research; *Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; *Institutional Evaluation; Models; Program Implementation; Self Evaluation (Groups); *Technical Institutes; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Lakeshore Technical College WI

ABSTRACT

A study developed a plan for implementing the Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS) Institutional Effectiveness Model at Lakeshore Technical College (LTC). A literature review identified several models in place for assessing effectiveness at colleges. Efforts were underway in the WTCS to develop implementation strategies. The president and administrators for educational and administrative services at LTC established the criteria for the implementation plan by brainstorming and then grouping the items under similar categories. To assess progress toward implementing an effectiveness model, a survey was conducted to identify what was being done, who was responsible, and what the status of the effort was. Results indicated a significant amount of assessment activity, most in the Goal Oriented Adult Learning Program, and a limited number of future planned activities. Plans from two other colleges in the WTCS were reviewed as benchmarks. A draft implementation plan was developed with these components: implementation activities, steering committee, implementation schedule, alignment of LTC model to WTCS model, assessment of progress, and data collection standards. The LTC Student Academic Achievement Model and WTCS Institutional Effectiveness Model were found to compare in all areas except student grades. LTC's executive committee adopted the revised plan. (Appendixes contain 14 references, implementation plan criteria, progress assessment form, and implementation plan.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 411 442

DEVELOPMENT OF AN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR ASSESSING INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AT LAKESHORE TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Governance and Management

Michael A. Lanser

Lakeshore Technical College

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Susan A. Torbenson

Chicago Cluster

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. A. Lanser

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

A practicum report presented to Programs for Higher Education in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education

Nova Southeastern University

December, 1995

CE 074 768

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract of a practicum report presented to Nova Southeastern University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education

DEVELOPMENT OF AN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR ASSESSING INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AT LAKESHORE TECHNICAL COLLEGE

by

Michael A. Lanser

December, 1995

The problem addressed was that efforts to implement the Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS) Institutional Effectiveness Model at Lakeshore Technical College (LTC) were fragmented and overall unsuccessful. The purpose of the study was to develop a plan for implementing the WTCS Institutional Effectiveness Model at LTC. The research questions were "To what degree has LTC assessed institutional effectiveness?" And, "What implementation plan should be adopted by LTC?"

Data from the literature review revealed several models in place for assessing effectiveness at colleges. Efforts were also underway in the Wisconsin Technical College System to develop implementation strategies.

The study resulted in the development of a plan to implement the WTCS Institutional Effectiveness Model. The plan included appointing a faculty steering committee to facilitate the

development of assessment measures and the development of a job description for the steering committee chair. Current assessment efforts were also identified.

The study concluded that the implementation plan will facilitate the implementation of institutional effectiveness at LTC. Faculty involvement will be assured by through the appointment of the steering committee and the plan will provide the framework for LTC to organize for the next North Central Accreditation visit.

Recommendations from the study included implementing the plan, developing a communication program, developing a system for collecting and reporting data, publishing an assessment report, assigning responsibility for maintaining assessment efforts to the research department, conducting additional research to assess strategic plan accomplishment, and that the steering committee provide the leadership for the next North Central Accreditation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1.	INTRODUCTION	6
	Nature of the Problem	6
	Purpose of the Study	7
	Significance to the Institution	7
	Relationship to Seminar	7
	Research Questions	8
	Definition of Terms	8
2.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	9
	Nationwide Institutional Effectiveness Efforts	10
	Wisconsin Technical College System Model	14
	Lakeshore Technical College Efforts	17
	North Central Accreditation	20
	Summary	21
3.	METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES	23
	Assumptions	25
	Limitations	26
4.	RESULTS	27
5.	DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	33
	Discussion	33
	Conclusions	34
	Implications	34
	Recommendations	35

REFERENCES 37

APPENDIXES 39

A. Implementation Plan Criteria 40

B. Formative Committee 41

C. Progress Assessment Form 42

D. Summative Committee 50

E. Implementation Plan 51

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Lakeshore Technical College (LTC), one of Wisconsin's 16 technical colleges and part of the Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS), operates under a shared governance concept with the state and local boards equally responsible for setting and administering policies. The college offers associate degree and technical diploma programs, and adult and continuing education courses and is accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA). In 1992, LTC received a ten-year accreditation from North Central.

Nature of the Problem

After the accreditation process, a plan for assessing student academic achievement at LTC was developed and committees were organized to carry it out. Although a plan for assessing student academic achievement was developed, efforts to implement it were fragmented and overall unsuccessful. The ability to measure outcomes is an important factor in determining if LTC is meeting customer needs. In addition, the Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS) developed an institutional effectiveness model and started organizing to implement it. This has added to the fragmentation of effort because some aspects of both plans match, others were only similar. To maintain accreditation standards, coordinated systems must be in place to help the college measure outcomes.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to develop a plan for implementing the Wisconsin Technical College System Institutional Effectiveness Model at Lakeshore Technical College. The plan identifies the priorities for implementation, the components to be implemented, a time schedule and the roles and responsibilities of the people involved.

Significance to the Institution

North Central Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (NCA) required a plan for assessing student academic achievement be developed and implemented at LTC by the next accreditation visit in the year 2002. In response to the NCA requirement, the Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS) formed a state-wide committee to develop a model for institutional effectiveness for each of the 16 colleges to use as a guide. The WTCS model was created to align data gathering at all 16 colleges and incorporated assessing student academic achievement. The WTCS Institutional Effectiveness model was adopted by the LTC board as a priority in the college's Five-Year Strategic Plan beginning in 1995.

Relationship to Seminar

This practicum is directly related to the Governance and Management seminar in that principles of change, quality, and management will be incorporated into the LTC implementation plan. The completion of this project will require an in-depth study of

institutional effectiveness, quality, and the initiation of change.

Research Questions

Two research questions were addressed in this study. First, "To what degree has LTC assessed institutional effectiveness?" Second, "What implementation plan should be adopted by LTC?"

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this practicum, the following terms need clarification:

Institutional effectiveness. How well the institution meets the needs of the customers being served.

Student Academic Achievement. Indicators of students' learning. Examples of data may include success and satisfaction with a program, course, or service. This is one area of institutional effectiveness.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools Commissions on Institutions of Higher Education (1994) state that institutions must take responsibility for finding ways to improve the educational programs they offer. Assessing institutional effectiveness can provide information to decision makers to determine if the programs, courses, and services offered by the college are achieving stated outcomes (Alfred & Carter, 1994, p.1).

Higher education has not had to cope with the issues of achieving outcomes. During the 1970s and 1980s total enrollment in American colleges grew and with that growth a substantial number of institutions became large, highly complex organizations (Anderson & Meyerson, 1992). LTC experienced this growth as well during that period. In recent years, however, enrollments have decreased which is causing more attention to be paid to the performance of the institution.

Measuring performance should be an ongoing activity and is a way to assess where an organization wants to be (Massey & Meyerson, 1994). The Wisconsin Technical College System has developed core indicators of effectiveness in the areas of student achievement and satisfaction, employer satisfaction, organizational quality, and public perception and satisfaction. The objective of the model is to give the WTCS some valid and

consistent means of assessing both college and system performance (Alfred & Carter, 1994).

Nationwide Institutional Effectiveness Efforts

A nation's ability to advance depends in part on the quality of its higher education system. Moreover, the quality of the educational system largely depends on a college's interest in continuously improving its teaching practices (Shrawder, 1992, p.1). Continuous improvement focuses on improving daily functions through the use of measurement and monitoring. Critical processes are assessed and plans are made to improve the process (Moran, Collett, & Cote, 1991). Improvement in processes that serve customers should increase customer satisfaction.

Businesses serve customers by using well-defined processes. Successful businesses focus on the customer and measure success by customer satisfaction. Businesses continually monitor their process to ensure high levels of service and seek opportunities for improvement to remain competitive. In the classroom the business is educating students; the product is knowledge. Like business, the classroom is process-oriented. There are two processes -- teaching and learning. In this analogy, the student is customer, and the instructor is service provider. Success is measured by student satisfaction with learning (Braccia, 1994, p.5).

If the success of educational institutions is measured by student satisfaction, educational processes must be monitored to

ensure high levels of service. Seybert suggests a process for colleges to follow in initiating assessment:

> Initiating assessment in the community college is a critical stage of the process and can be structured in 10 steps, subject to the unique profile of the individual college. 1. Create an institutional effectiveness assessment task force. 2. Examine the college mission statement. 3. Design an institutional plan or model to guide the assessment program. 4. Determine and prioritize the specific assessments to be undertaken. 5. Inventory existing data collection efforts. 6. Determine what additional data collection procedures need to be implemented to inform the assessment priorities. 7. Start at the top of the priority list. 8. Be flexible, adaptive and prepared to change. 9. Be prepared and willing to publicly share results of assessments. 10. Keep in mind that the primary emphasis in assessment is on the improvement in teaching, learning and service to students (Seybert, 1993, pp. 12-13).

In assessing effectiveness efforts, in assessment should be focused on the improvement of teaching, learning, and service to students. Griffin points out that the area of institutional effectiveness is becoming more specialized and technical, therefore attention should be given to whether or not the right things are being measured.

> ... all performance measurement ultimately refers to individual performance. This is easy to forget when new

> approaches to institutional effectiveness measurement and new performance indicators seem to appear overnight. The literature concerned with measurement and institutional improvement is becoming more specialized and technical. And we are talking quite a bit about which of the measurements is the best indicator without examining whether we are measuring the right thing (Griffin, 1993, p.1).

The complexity of institutional effectiveness could cause a college to lose sight of what the measures are intended to do. Griffin goes on to discuss how performance measurement can be used to allocate resources.

> Ultimately, performance measurement concerns individual performance. People, not colleges, succeed or fail. We create problems and encourage gamesmanship because we use performance measurement to allocate resources to institutions. We should use performance measurement to allocate resources to serve students. Then, avoidance of institutional comparison becomes pointless, if performance measures address how we are meeting or not meeting student needs (Griffin, 1993, p.7).

An example of a performance based budgeting system can be found in Minnesota. The Commission on Reform and Efficiency (CORE) project initiated a performance based budgeting system in Minnesota Higher Education. The CORE was an attempt to improve state government. "The CORE Budgeting and Financial Management Project identified five problems, all of which should be familiar

to anyone working in educational administration. These are (1) a "use it or lose it" paradox, (2) a focus on inputs, (3) no link between budgeting and strategic planning, (4) limited information for decision making, and (5) a lack of program accountability" (Griffin, 1993, pp. 1-7). These problems can result in a inappropriate allocation of resources which will have a negative affect on teaching, learning, and service to students.

The commission identified a pilot to address the problems. The Minnesota Community College System served as a pilot agency and developed solutions for the five problems. The solutions, later became law and focused on increased institutional autonomy in exchange for greater accountability through performance based budgeting (Griffin, 1993, p.7).

> The CORE Project defined performance-based budgeting as ". . . a means of judging policies and programs by measuring their outcomes or results against agreed upon standards. A performance [budgeting] system provides the framework for measuring outcomes - not merely processes or workloads - and organizes the information so that it can be used effectively by political leaders, policy makers and program managers. Although the current North Central criteria include outcomes measurement, such outcomes are in relation to a particular institutional mission in a particular time and place. In contrast, the Minnesota CORE Project on Performance-based Budgeting introduces the explicit comparison on institutional

outcomes according to a fixed, external standard as the basis for resource allocation" (Griffin, 1993, p.7).

Meanwhile, the issue of institutional effectiveness was being addressed in the Wisconsin Technical College System.

Wisconsin Technical College System Model

The Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS) Administrator's Association agreed in December of 1992 to work with the Community College Consortium to develop a model for assessing institutional effectiveness specifically for the system. "The main objective of this project was to develop a comprehensive effectiveness model for adaptation within the context of the individual colleges . . . the effectiveness modeling project is a system-wide effort to identify core indicators that can be used locally by WTCS Colleges to respond to accountability initiatives, North Central accreditation, federal reporting requirements, quality management initiatives, and so forth" (Alfred, 1994, p.1).

A task force was appointed to develop a system-wide definition for institutional effectiveness, to provide input and direction for project activities, and to review consultant findings. "One of the guiding principles established by the task force in the early stages of the project was that externally dictated indicators of effectiveness while very important, should not be the starting point for identifying effectiveness indicators that were critical for the Wisconsin Technical Colleges." (Alfred, 1994, p.1)

The definition of effectiveness adopted by the WTCS task force was:

> An effective technical college is one that provides efficient educational programs and services that anticipate and respond to external and internal customer needs and result in outcomes that meet or exceed customer goals and expectations. (Alfred, 1994, p.2)

Seventeen core indicators of effectiveness were developed through input received from focus groups, analysis of North Central Association guidelines, and federal legislation. The seventeen indicators were:

> Employer Satisfaction. 1. Employer satisfaction with graduates' work skills/performance. Student Achievement and Satisfaction. 2. Identification of student needs, goals and interests. 3. Identification of student functional skills at entry. 4. Course completion. 5. Student grades. 6. Student satisfaction with courses, programs, and services. 7. Student retention rates. 8. Student completion and graduation rates. 9. Student achievement and educational goal(s). 10. Student knowledge and skills at exit. 11. Pass rates/scores on licensure exams. 12. Placement rates/employment success. Organizational Quality/Harmony/Efficiency (Internal Customer Satisfaction). 13. Achievement and institutional goals and standards. 14. Organizational climate. Public Perception/Satisfaction. 15. Articulation and linkages with external organizations. 16. Identification of customer needs and expectations. 17. Public satisfaction. (Alfred, 1994, pp.2-3)

The WTCS institutional effectiveness model was not intended to replace what colleges had been working on or had in place. It was meant to develop consistency among the colleges in their efforts to measure individual college performance and provide a means to measure the performance of the system. "At its initial meeting on June 23, 1994, the Institutional Effectiveness

Steering Team decided to concentrate on assessment activities that are most indicative of and important to student success" (Wisconsin Technical College System Institutional Effectiveness Model: Guidelines for Work groups, October 1994, p.3)

The steering committee organized three work groups to focus on student assessment and achievement. Each of the three work groups, namely: Student Needs, Goals, Interests at Entry/Exit; Student Skills at Entry/Exit; and Course Completion/Retention/Graduation made recommendations to operationalize each indicator for effective use at the college and/or statewide level. (Wisconsin Technical College System Institutional Effectiveness Model: Guidelines for Work groups, October 1994, p.3).

Each work group followed a six step process and used the following questions to ensure continuity in their work and that specific measures would become useful tools for determining effectiveness.

a. What are the information system needs (local and state) for this measure? b. How will this measure be tracked over time? How will it be used for improving effectiveness on a continuing basis? c. How are changes to this measure made? d. Is there a standard available for this measure? How does it compare with the state's measure? e. Is there buy in from the college administrators to obtain and use this measure for institutional improvement? f. What is the cost of obtaining and using this measure? g. Is there buy in from

stakeholders and other significant staff to obtain and use this measure for institutional improvement? (Wisconsin Technical College System Institutional Effectiveness Model: Guidelines for Workgroups. October 1994. p.9)

A final report was issued (Wisconsin technical college system institutional effectiveness model: Final report from work groups. October 1995) by the task force and listed outcomes and made recommendations in three areas including: a. Student Goals at Entry/Exit, b. Student Functional Skills at Entry/Exit, and c. Course Completion, Retention and Graduation. The recommendations in this report established a framework for individual colleges to adopt if they so chose. The colleges could then begin the data collection stage.

Lakeshore Technical College Efforts

In the fall of 1991 a task force was formed at LTC called the Student Academic Achievement Task Force. The purpose of the task force was to develop a model to measure the accomplishments of students' goals. The task force identified the focus for initial assessment efforts. Occupational competency programs were identified as the most critical for data collection and analysis to improve educational programs and services. (Assessing Student Academic Achievement, 1993, p.3). In addition, eleven critical student achievement assessment elements were identified including: (a) Quality Employer Satisfaction, (b) Quality Student Satisfaction, (c) Quality Student Support Services, (d) Quality Articulation, (e) Quality Instruction, (f) Quality Staff, (g)

Quality Environment, (h) Quality Evaluation by Students (i) Quality Facilities and Equipment, (j) Quality Career Exploration, and (k) Quality Student Life. Three items were selected from the eleven as starting points for Student Academic Achievement (SAA), Quality of Instruction (curriculum), Quality of Staff, and Quality of Employer Satisfaction (Assessing Student Academic Achievement, 1993, p.3).

After achieving its first purpose of developing a model, a second purpose was drafted in March 1992. The new purpose of the task force was to develop a road map for use of measurement techniques for each element in the initial phases of instruction (curriculum), staff, and employer satisfaction with occupational programs (Assessing Student Academic Achievement, 1993, p.4).

The task force completed the following phases of the implementation plan:

Phase I. 1. Analyze North Central input. 2. Task force members set up focus groups in division/department/work units to help staff gain understanding and internalization about student academic achievement and to gather input from their peers, using the focus question, Where do I fit into the student academic achievement model with what I do every day?

Phase II. 1. Prioritize input. 2. Identify systems and processes to implement model.

Phase III. 1. Identify training needs to use systems and processes to implement the model.

The following elements of the plan were not completed.

1. Network various groups working on institutional breakthrough items.
   a. comprehensive marketing
   b. Program Value Analysis/quality audits
   c. resources
   d. performance based education
   e. scheduling
   f. student academic achievement
   g. administrative cabinet vision sessions
   h. NCA strengths and areas of continuous improvement
   i. Staff Quality Service steering committee
2. Create a team of representatives from the above mentioned groups to:
   a. Address relationships of these groups to each other.
   b. Capture the voice of the customer (internal and external) in systematic way.
   c. Prioritize the voice of the customer.
   d. Identify institution systems and processes to meet the voice of the customer.
   e. Identify training needs in order to use systems and processes.
   f. Continuously measure and provide feedback for continuous improvement. (Assessing Student Academic Achievement, 1993, p.28)

North Central Accreditation

Lakeshore Technical College is accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. This accreditation shows both to other institutions and to the public that LTC meets certain criteria set forth by the Commission. Accreditation with North Central is voluntary. North Central identifies General Institutional Requirements that describe the requirements for affiliation with the commission and serve as assessment measures as an institution goes through the self assessment process (Handbook of Accreditation, 1994, pp. 15-24).

Accreditation uses a process that includes peer reviews and site visits to confirm or invalidate self studies. It concentrates on institutional goals, governance, curriculum, faculty, student support services, and the library and determines whether finances, facilities, and equipment can adequately support the institutions goals and curriculum. In the early 1990s, criteria were added that focused on institutional quality and student achievement (National Policy Board on Higher Education Institutional Accreditation, 1994, p.5).

The system of voluntary accreditation, peer review, and self regulation has come under attack as reported in the Special Report on Accreditation (1994, p. 3) from the National Policy Board on Higher Education Institutional Accreditation. The 1992 Amendments to Higher Education Act sought to federalize accreditation. Congress subsequently authorized State

Postsecondary Review Entities (SPREs). College presidents became dissatisfied with the growing number of specialized accrediting agencies. Meanwhile, the national body supporting accreditation, the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA), was dissolved in 1993.

The perceived problems with accreditation that were identified by the National Policy Board included a lack of understanding of what accreditation was supposed to assure, the number of accrediting agencies and the variation among them, and a weak national presence (1994, p. 4). The assessment processes used by an institution in determining institutional effectiveness were supposed to have a relationship to the General Institutional Requirements used in the accreditation process. The problems associated with accreditation caused confusion as colleges worked toward implementing measures for institutional effectiveness.

Summary

Institutions must take responsibility for improving the programs courses and services they offer. Measuring institutional effectiveness can provide information for colleges to use in determining if outcomes have been achieved. Massey (1994) states that measuring performance should be an ongoing activity and used to assess where an organization wants to be.

Student satisfaction is a key measure of institutional effectiveness. Seybert (1993, pp. 12-13) indicates that assessment efforts should focus on teaching, learning, and service to students. Resource allocation should be driven by the

performance of the institution in meeting desired outcomes (Griffen, 1993, p. 7).

The Wisconsin Technical College System has developed a model for colleges in the system to use to guide their data collection and assessment efforts. The priority in implementing the model was identified to be those activities instrumental in student success. Lakeshore Technical College (LTC) has developed a plan for assessing student academic achievement. LTC also is accredited by the North Central Association, which is a driving force in institutional effectiveness.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

The development problem solving methodology was used for this study. Eight procedures were used to complete this development practicum. First, a review of literature was conducted. Topics related to institutional effectiveness, quality, and assessment were reviewed.

Second, criteria were established for the implementation plan. The criteria were based upon the information from the literature review and input from the President, the Administrator for Instruction, and the Administrator for Administrative Services at LTC. The complete listing of criteria are included in Appendix A.

Third, a formative committee of individuals was organized to discuss the issues related to implementing an institutional effectiveness model and to provide feedback during the development stage. The committee included the Administrator for Administrative Services, the Administrator for Research, the Administrator for Educational Services, the Chair of the Student Academic Achievement Task Force, and the Dean of Public Safety at LTC who was also the chair of the North Central Accreditation Steering Committee and self study (Appendix B).

Fourth, an assessment was conducted to find out the progress already made toward implementing the institutional effectiveness model. An instrument was developed by the formative committee based on the WTCS Institutional Effectiveness Model (Appendix C).

The committee wanted to find out what was being done, by who, and what the status of the effort was. Additionally, the respondents were asked to identify any future directions in assessment, the time-line, and person responsible. Lakeshore Technical College staff members in the Skills Center, Financial Services, Data Processing, Vocational Assessment, Research, Student Academic Achievement, Educational Services, and Goal Oriented Adult Learning were chosen by the committee to respond to the questions because of their responsibilities. The instrument was organized in a matrix format and sent out through inter-campus mail and then a followed up with a personal contact by the Administrator of Administrative Services. After the questions were answered they were submitted to the Administrator of Administrative Services and compiled. The results were distributed to the formative committee for review. Respondants were contacted again if clarification was needed.

In addition, the LTC Student Academic Achievement Model was compared to the WTCS Institutional Effectiveness Model to determine the relationship. This was done by having the formative committee compare the criteria from both models to determine the relationship.

The results of the assessment and the comparison of the WTCS and LTC model were used by the committee in determining to what degree LTC had assessed institutional effectiveness and how those efforts related to the WTCS model. A copy of the results of the assessment is included in the implementation plan in Appendix E.

Fifth, implementation plans were obtained from three other technical colleges in the state of Wisconsin including Fox Valley Technical College, and Milwaukee Area Technical College. These institutions were selected based on the recommendation of the formative committee because of their efforts in institutional effectiveness and the availability of a written document. Their plans were shared with members of the formative committee and reviewed by the Administrator of Administrative Services and used as a reference in the development of the LTC Implementation Plan.

Sixth, a draft implementation plan developed by the formative committee and written by Administrator of Administrative Services.

Seventh, the draft was reviewed by the summative committee for validation purposes, using the criteria previously established. This committee of consisted of the President and the Administrator for Educational Services at LTC. The Institutional Effectiveness coordinator for the Wisconsin Technical College System (Appendix D) was sent a copy of the plan for review and comment. Eighth, revisions were made as deemed necessary by the summative committee.

Assumptions

For this study, it was assumed that members of the formative committee had the knowledge to guide the development of the project. It was also assumed that institutional effectiveness is a priority of the college and the Wisconsin Technical College

System. It is further assumed that the summative committee's evaluation of the implementation plan is valid.

Limitations

The plan is limited in that it is specific to the needs of Lakeshore Technical College. Another limitation is that the plan focuses on the Wisconsin Technical College System Institutional Effectiveness model.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

The outcome of each procedural component is explained in the following paragraphs. The review of literature validated the need for LTC to have the ability to assess effectiveness.

Criteria were established for the implementation plan by the President, the Administrator for Educational Services, and the Administrator for Administrative Services at LTC. The criteria were established through a brainstorm process and then grouping the items under similar categories. After the items were grouped headers were written describing the items grouped underneath. The criteria resulting from this process were:

1. The plan must be faculty driven and provide for college-wide involvement.

2. The plan must incorporate into existing structures, plans, and systems as much as possible.

3. The plan must be part of staff members jobs, not something extra.

4. The plan must be consistent with North Central requirements.

5. The plan must identify roles, responsibilities, and timeliness.

To assess the progress toward implementing an effectiveness model, a survey (Appendix C) was distributed to identify what is currently being done, who is responsible, and what is the status of the effort. Additionally, the staff were asked what the

future direction of assessment was taking in their area, the time-line, and person responsible to do it. The questions on the survey were developed by the formative committee to find out what progress was being made. The formative committee identified the following LTC staff members to complete the survey because of their involvement in assessment activities: the Skills Center Manager, the Financial Services Manager, the Data Processing Manager, the Computer Services Manager, the Vocational Assessment Manager, the Administrator of Research, the School-to-Work Coordinator, the North Central Steering Committee Chair, the Administrator of Educational Services, and the manager of the Goal Oriented Adult Learning Program.

The information from the surveys was consolidated and sent to the formative committee for review. A copy of the results appears in appendix C. The results of the survey showed a significant amount of assessment activity taking place. Most of the activity was taking place in the Goal Oriented Adult Learning Program. This program received a significant amount of federal funding and had many reporting requirements, which explains why there was more assessment activity in that area.

The survey also showed a limited number of future activities planned for assessment. Because of the limited response in this area the results were not summarized.

Plans from two colleges in the Wisconsin Technical College System, Fox Valley Technical College (FVTC) and Madison Area Technical College, were reviewed as benchmarks. The FVTC plan,

Plan for Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness, primarily focused on surveys and needs assessments and developed a schedule of when the surveys and assessments would be conducted ("Plan for assessment," 1994).

The MATC plan, Plan for Assessing Student Learning Outcomes, identified objectives, measures, use of results, responsibility, and timeliness for institutional, program, and course-level outcome measures ("Plan for assessing," 1995). Neither plan had a direct link to the WTCS Institutional Effectiveness Model. Both the FVTC plan and the MATC plan were developed before the WTCS model was in place.

Based on the review of the FVTC & MATC plans a draft implementation plan was developed by the LTC formative committee. The committee brainstormed the all the possible activities necessary to implement the WTCS model. After the brainstorming was complete the list was checked for similar items. Those items that were similar in nature combined. Next the items were arranged in sequential order. The following activities were identified in the implementation plan:

1. Establish a framework for measuring institutional effectiveness at Lakeshore Technical College.
2. Form a steering committee.
3. Allocate resources.
4. Set priorities for assessment.
5. Develop assessment measures according to priorities.
6. Establish data/information collection standards.

After the implementation activities were identified the committee began working on the components of the plan. The components of the plan included 1) implementation activities, 2) steering committee 3) implementation schedule, 4) alignment of LTC model to WTCS model, 5) assessment of progress, and 6) data collection standards.

One of the activities of the plan was to establish a steering committee. The steering committee should consist of a faculty chair and faculty representatives from each instructional division. Next, a schedule was developed for implementing the core indicator measures from the WTCS model based on priorities set be the LTC Board of Directors. The top two priorities were to develop assessment measures for student knowledge and skills at exit and the identification of student needs, goals, & interests. Additional priorities were set at developing assessment measures for student retention and withdrawl, employer satisfaction, and placement rates and success.

The summative committee also compared the WTCS Institutional Effectiveness model to the LTC Student Academic Achievement Model to determine the relationship between the two models. The results of the comparison are contained in the Implementation Plan in Appendix E. A group process was used to complete the comparison. The summative committee developed a matrix with the items from the WTCS model on the vertical axis and the items from the the LTC Student Academic Achievement on the horizontal axis. Each item from the two models were compared against each other

and concencensus was reached by the summative committee if their was a relationship or not. If there was a relationship the appropriate box in the matrix was marked. The results showed that the LTC Student Academic Achievement Model compares to the WTCS model in all areas except student grades. In addition, three items from the LTC model matched up most frequently. Those items from the LTC model were 1) LTC provides occupational competency programming that is timely and flexible to meet the student needs, 2) LTC's curriculum provides the student with the skills relevant to the occupation and satisfaction of the employer, and 3) LTC staff are customer focused. These results indicate that the LTC Student Academic Achievement model does relate to the WTCS model and that three items in the LTC model account for most of the relationship.

A draft plan was written by the Administrator of Administtrative Services incorporating the timeline and components, and presented to the formative committee. After reviewing the draft the the following revisions were made to the plan based on the recommendations of the formative committee. Research and data processing were changed from members of the committee to support resources. A job description for the steering committee chair was developed and incorporated into the plan. Criteria for selecting the chair was also developed. The core indicator implementation schedule was adjusted to start with the 1996-97 school year. Responsibility for data collection was changed from the steering committee to those people with

responsibility for the data systems. Data collection should follow the standards used by the research department.

The Summative Committee reviewed the plan. As part of the summative committees review the plan was discussed with the President and the President Elect of the Lakeshore Education Association, the group that represents faclty members at LTC. The following revisions were made based on the input from the summative committee. A line item in the budget was added to compensate the steering committee chair. Another revision was to allocate time from support staff in the Research Department to provide clerical assistance to the implementation. The revised plan was adopted by the college's Executive Committee. A copy of the plan is contained in Appendix E.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

The implementation plan was consistent with the model suggested by Sybert (1993, pp. 12-13). The steering committee, consisting primarily of faculty members, will have representation from all areas of the college and provide leadership for determining measures for the core indicator in the WTCS Institutional Effectiveness Model. Measures for some of the core indicators are being developed by work groups organized by the WTCS.

An survey found that there was assessment practices in place in a number of areas of the college. The Goal Oriented Adult Learning program showed the most activity. Assessment practices are more advanced because the program has hed to comply with more stringent reporting requirements due to the nature of its funding. The program is supported primarily by Federal funds. The GOAL program can provide a model to the steering committee as the implementation is planned.

The framework of the implementation plan can provide the framework for the next North Central Accreditation visit. Annual reporting will provide a mechanism for communicating assessment efforts, and the steering committee provides a structure for completiong the self-study and preparing for the visit.

Conclusions

The implementation plan will facilitate the implementation of institutional effectiveness at LTC. By appointing a faculty member as chair of the steering committee, faculty involvement will be assured. In addition, the plan will provide the framework for LTC to organize for the next North Central Accreditation visit.

Implications

Carrying out the implementation plan will enable LTC to implement the Student Academic Achievement plan that resulted from the last North Central visit. It will also align the Student Academic Achievement plan with the WTCS Institutional Effectiveness model and organize and align resources internally at LTC toward implementing the model.

Recommendations

It was recommended that the LTC Institutional Effectiveness Implementation Plan be implemented as presented in Appendix E. A faculty member should be appointed as the chair of the steering committee by March 1996 and have a steering committee appointed by June 1996 so work can begin prior to the start of the 1996-97 school year.

It was recommended that the steering committee chair initiate a communication program to communicate the implementation plan and progress being made to LTC staff. The program should be ready by the start of the 1996-97 school year and should occur on a regular basis.

It was recommended that a system be developed and implemented to support the data collection and reporting needs of the committee. The data processing systems manager should be assigned responsibility for accomplishing this objective in the 1996-97 school year. Design of the system should take place in the 1996-97 school year with implementation targeted for july 1997.

It was recommended that current assessment efforts be organized by the research department by January 1997 and that this be updated on an annual basis. The research department needs to operate in support of the steering committee and help to organize and maintain those efforts currently in progress.

It was recommended that an annual assessment report be developed by April 1997 and communicated to the LTC board, administration, staff, and the WTCS state office. This report should summarize all assessment efforts at LTC and identify recommendations. The report should be incorporated into the regular reporting processes of the college. The plan can provide information to staff for planning and decision making. In future years the plan should follow-up on any recommendations that are made.

It was recommended that additional research be considered in assessing the achievement of the LTC Strategic Plan. Research in this area is needed to determine if the strategies of the college are being achieved. This research should occur prior to the next North Central Accreditation.

Finally, it was recommended that the Insititutional Effectiveness Steering Copmmittee transition into the committee that will lead LTC through the next scheduled North Central Accreditation visit in the year 2002. The familiarity the committee gains with the organization and assessment will help in preparing for the visit.

REFERENCES

Alfred, A. L., & Carter, P., (January 25, 1994). Wisconsin technical college system: Effectiveness model pp. 1-3. Madison WI: Wisconsin Technical College System.

Anderson, R., & Meyerson, J. (1992). Productivity & higher education: improving the effectiveness of faculty, facilities, and financial resources. Princeton, NJ: Peterson's Guides.

Assessing student academic achievement. A planning report submitted to NCA. (January, 1993). Cleveland, WI: Lakeshore Technical College.

Braccia, J. The customer-driven classroom. (August/September 1994). The Teaching Professor, 8(7) p. 5. Madison, WI: Magna Publications.

Griffin, T. (Fall 1993, v.3n.2). Performance measurement and performance-based budgeting: A beginning practitioner's orientation. IE In Focus: Issues, Trends and Methodologies in Institutional Effectiveness p. 1-7. Columbia, SC: Midlands Technical College.

Massey, W., & Meyerson, J, (1994). Measuring institutional performance in higher education. Princeton, NJ: Peterson's Guides.

Moran, J. W., Collett, C., & Cote, C. (1991). Daily management. Methuen, MA: Goal/QPC.

National Policy Board on Higher Education Institutional Accreditation. (1994). Independence, accreditation, and the public interest: Special report on accreditation p.5. Washington DC.

North Central Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. (March 1994). Handbook of accreditation 1994-95. Chicago, IL.

Plan for assessing student learning outcomes. January 11, 1995, Madison WI: Madison Area Technical College.

Plan for assessment of institutional effectiveness. November, 1994, Appleton WI: Fox Valley Technical College.

Seybert, J. A. (March-April 1993. p. 12-13) Community College Strategies: How to initiate and Assessment Program. Assessment Update 5.2. Found in Community College Caps, 8(1). September-October, 1993.

Shrawder, J. H. (August 15, 1992, v.4 n5) Kaizen--Commitment to Continuous Improvement. The Adjunct Mentor p. 1. Mattoon, Il: Pentronics Publishing.

Wisconsin technical college system institutional effectiveness model: Guidelines for work groups. October, 1994.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A

Implementation Plan Criteria

The following criteria were developed for the implementation plan.

1. The plan must be faculty driven and provide for college-wide involvement.
2. The plan must incorporate into existing structures, plans, and systems as much as possible.
3. The plan must be part of staff members jobs, not something extra.
4. The plan must be consistent with North Central requirements.
5. The plan must identify roles, responsibilities, and timeliness.
6. The plan must be capable of being carried out within the existing resources of the college.

Appendix B

Formative Committee

Members of the formative committee were selected based on their responsibilities in the organization and their prior experience in institutional effectiveness. Listed below are the members of the committee.

Dr. Patrick Lacey	Administrator - Educational Services, LTC
Mr. Michael Lanser	Administrator - Administrative Services
Dr. James Malmberg	Administrator - Research, LTC
Ms. Cindy Peissig	Student Academic Achievement Task Force Chair
Dr. Judy Powers	Dean of Public Safety and North Central Accreditation Steering Committee Chair, LTC

Appendix C

Progress Assessment Form

WTCS Institutional Effectiveness Model Assessment of Progress						
Core Indicator	1 What is Being Done	2 By Who	3 Status	4 Future Direction	5 By When	6 By Who
ACHIEVEMENT AND STUDENT SATISFACTION						
Identification of Student Needs, Goals and Interests						
Identification of Student Functional Skills at Entry						
Course Completion						
Student Grades						
Student Satisfaction with Courses, Programs, and Services						
Student Retention/Withdrawal Rates						
Student Completion and Graduation Rates						

Student Achievement of Educational Goal(s)						
Student Knowledge and Skills at Exit						
Pass Rates/Scores of Licensure Exams						
Placement Rates/Employment Success						
EMPLOYER SATISFACTION						
Employer Satisfaction with Graduates' Work Skills/Performance						
ORGANIZATIONAL QUALITY						
Achievement of Institutional Goals and Standards						
Organizational Climate						
PUBLIC PERCEPTION AND SATISFACTION						
Articulation and Linkages with External Organizations						

Identification of Customer Needs and Expectations						
Public Satisfaction						

PROGRESS ASSESSMENT PROCESS

1. What is being done.

   List those activities you know have been attempted or are currently being done to assess the core indicator.

2. By Who.

   Identify who is responsible for the activity.

3. Status.

   Identify the current status of the activity using the following numerical scale.

   4 = The activity has been completed.

   3 = The activity is actively being worked on and on track.

   2 = The activity is being worked on but behind schedule.

   1 = the activity is behind schedule.

4. Future direction.

   Based on what has or has not been accomplished what do you see as the future direction for developing assessment systems and measures for this indicator.

5. By when.

   When does this direction need to be accomplished.

6. By who.

   Who do you see as responsible for the planning and development of the activities necessary to accomplish the future direction.

Progress Assessment Results

The following table lists the results of the assessment.

Core Indicator	Effort	Responsibility
Student Achievement And Satisfaction		
Identification of Student Needs Goals and Interests	ASSET Test	Vocational Assessment
	Vocational Assessment Process	Vocational Assessment
	Admission Interview	Center Support Services
Identification of Student Functional Skills at Entry	ASSET Test	Vocational Assessment
	Assessment: TABE, WRAT, Nelson-Denny	GOAL Instructors
Course Completion	Test	GOAL Instructors
	Documentation of skills to match course competencies	GOAL Instructors
	Client Reporting	Instructional Staff
Student Grades	Pass or Incomplete	GOAL Instructors
	Grade Reports	Instructional Staff
Student Satisfaction with Courses, Programs, and Services	Continuous Improvement Feedback Form	GOAL Instructors
	Seminar Survey	Business & Industry Services
	ABE/GED Feedback form	Instructional Staff

	ESL Conferences	Instructional Staff
Student Retention/Withdrawal Rates	Examination of locator list to identify drops and withdrawals	GOAL Instructors
	Personal phone contacts	GOAL Instructors
	Advancement to higher level course in program	GOAL Instructors
	Number of students returning to program	GOAL Instructors
	Enrollment follow-up	Enrollment office
Student Completion and Graduation Rates	High school completion credentials; GED, HSED, High School Diploma	GOAL Instructors
	Program entry	GOAL Instructors
	Initial and continued employment data on client reporting form	GOAL Instructors
	Client reporting	Instructional Staff
Student Achievement of Educational Goals	Track progress of goal attainment	GOAL Instructors
Student Knowledge and Skills at Exit	Standardized test score gains	GOAL Instructors

	Competency based performance	GOAL Instructors
	Instructor (program/course) feedback	GOAL Instructors
	Student course of study	Instructional Staff
Pass Rates/Scores of Licensure Exams	Licensure Passed	Deans
Placement Rates/Employment Success	Placement reports	Placement
	Six month follow-up	Placement
Employer Satisfaction		
Employer Satisfaction with Graduates	Employer follow-up	Placement
	Employer survey	Placement
Organizational Quality		
Achievement of Institutional Goals and Standards	Synergistic planning progress checks	Executive Committee
	Annual planning	Managers
Organizational Climate	Radar chart	In-service committee
Public Perception and Satisfaction		
Articulation and Linkages with External Organizations	38.14 contracts	Business and Industry Services
	High School contracts	School to Work

	Articulation agreements	Student Services
Identification of Customer Needs and Expectations		
Public Satisfaction		

Appendix D

Summative Committee

Members of the formative committee were selected based on their responsibilities. Listed below are the members of the committee.

Dr. Patrick Lacey	Administrator - Educational Services, LTC
Dr. Dennis Ladwig	President, LTC
Ms. Deborah Mahaffey	Institutional Effectiveness Coordinator, WTCS Board

Appendix E

Implementation Plan

LAKESHORE TECHNICAL COLLEGE

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

1995

INTRODUCTION

In 1991, Lakeshore Technical College (LTC) received a ten-year accreditation from the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA). After the accreditation, a plan for assessing student academic achievement at LTC was developed and committees were organized to carry it out. A plan for assessing student academic achievement was developed; however, efforts to implement it were fragmented and overall unsuccessful.

The ability to measure outcomes is an important factor in determining if LTC is meeting customer needs. In addition, the Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS) developed an Institutional Effectiveness model and started organizing to implement it. This has added to the fragmentation of effort because some aspects of both plans match, others are only similar. To maintain accreditation standards, coordinated systems must be in place to help the college measure outcomes.

North Central Association indicated that a model for assessing student academic achievement had to be developed and implemented at LTC by the next accreditation visit in the year 2002. The WTCS has also developed a model for institutional effectiveness for each of the sixteen colleges to use as a guide. In addition, the implementation of the WTCS Institutional Effectiveness model was adopted by the board as a priority in the colleges Five-Year Strategic Plan starting in 1995. The institutional priority states that:

> Lakeshore Technical College will implement systems to measure accomplished outcomes against expected outcomes. The direction of LTC in measuring outcomes will focus on implementing the institutional effectiveness model and identifying outcomes for the things we do and follow up with the measuring of results based on the identified outcomes.

A plan was developed to guide the implementation of the WTCS Institutional Effectiveness Model and contains the following components:

- Implementation Activities
- Steering Committee Chair Job Description and Selection Criteria
- Institutional Effectiveness Core Indicator Implementation Schedule
- Alignment of LTC Model to WTCS Model
- Assessment of Progress
- Data Collection Standards

IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES

Listed below are the activities involved in implementing institutional effectiveness at Lakeshore Technical College.

1.0 Establish a framework for measuring institutional effectiveness.

- 1.1 Adopt Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS) Institutional Effectiveness Model as "umbrella" for LTC.
- 1.2 Align LTC Student Academic Achievement Plan to the WTCS model.

2.0 Form a steering committee. It is important that the institutional effectiveness efforts be driven by the faculty. A steering committee will be led by a faculty member with representation from each division. The steering committee is responsible for coordinating all aspects of the implementation and reporting regularly to the institution. The responsibilities of the steering committee will include:

1. Communicating what is happening.
2. Read related reports.
3. Make sure things keep moving.
4. Monitor activities of the state.

- 2.1 Appoint a faculty member as chair.

  The role of the chair is to orchestrate, initiate, and coordinate LTC's institutional effectiveness activities.

- 2.2 Appoint steering committee members. Membership should include representation from the Executive Committee, Deans, faculty (1 from each division), LTC Manitowoc/Sheboygan, Support Staff, and Student Services. Members will be selected by the Steering Committee Chair and the Administrator of Educational Services.

- 2.3 Organize support resources. Representatives from Data Processing and Research will be available to support the steering committee. Clerical assistance will be provided by the Research Department. An office in student services will be assigned for use by the steering committee chair.

3.0 Allocate resources. A total budget of $23,000 will be allocated to provide resources for the committee to accomplish its purpose.

3.1	Personal Services	15,000
3.2	Staff development/training	2,000
3.3	Support Staff	2,500
3.4	North Central Annual Meeting	2,500
3.5	Current Expenses	1,000
3.6	Office space.	

4.0 Set Priorities for Assessment. Priorities will be set in the following order (1) LTC Board Priorities (2) State priorities when they are implemented (3) Lower priority items that are being worked on already.

4.1 WTCS priorities. The WTCS Institutional Effectiveness Steering Committee has identified the following priorities which were adopted by the Presidents Association.

- Student Knowledge & Skills at Exit
- Identification of Student Needs, Goals, and Interests
- Student Retention/Withdrawal
- Student Completion & Graduation Rates
- Student Achievement of Educational Goals
- Identification of Student Functional Skills at Entry
- Pass Rates/Scores of Licensure Exams
- Course Completion
- Student Satisfaction

4.2 LTC priorities. The LTC Board has identified the following priorities.

- Student Knowledge & Skills at Exit
- Employer Satisfaction
- Identification of Students Needs, Goals & Interests

4.3 Priorities must be incorporated into the Educational and Administrative Plans.

5.0 Develop assessment measures according to priorities.

5.1 Steering committee will develop measures for assessing the prioritized core indicators.
5.2 Develop implementation plans.

STEERING COMMITTEE CHAIR JOB DESCRIPTION AND SELECTION PROCESS

Responsibility: The position is responsible for orchestrating, initiating, and coordinating LTC's institutional effectiveness activities. The position will report to the Administrator of Educational Services.

Duties: It is expected that the chair be accountable for the following duties.

1. Facilitate the implementation of the WTCS Institutional Effectiveness Model.
2. Coordinate with staff and committees across the college on processes related to effectiveness.
3. Facilitate measurement of core indicators of effectiveness for institutional and departmental analysis.
4. Work with staff on incorporating institutional effectiveness goals into their annual planning.
5. Prepare an annual Institutional Effectiveness Report.

Eligibility: All full-time members of the Lakeshore Education Association with a Bachelors degree are eligible to apply.

Criteria for Selection: The following criteria will be used by the selection team as criteria in making their recommendation to the Administrator of Educational Services.

- Three years full-time experience at LTC.
- Experience in a North Central Accreditation process.
- Meeting management and leadership skills.
- Ability to network with people in the organization.
- Understanding LTC quality initiatives.
- Understanding of accreditation agency requirements.
- Availability for non-school hour commitments.
- Sense of data collection.
- SRI/Gallup interview.
- Cost effectiveness to institution.

Selection Process: The following steps will be used to guide the hiring process.

1. Post internally.
2. Applications accepted.
3. Selection team is formed consisting of an LEA representative, Past North Central Steering committee chair, the Chair of the Student Academic Achievement Task Force and the Administrator for Educational Services.

4. Selection team screens all candidates.
5. Selection team interviews candidates.
6. SRI/Gallup supervisor interview is given to top candidates.
7. Selection committee makes recommendation.
8. Administrator of Educational Services makes hiring decision and awards position.

Compensation: Ten hours per week will be compensated for this work.

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS CORE INDICATOR IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

The following schedule lists the implementation timetable for the core indicators based on the priorities set by the LTC board and the WTCS Administrators Association.

1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01
	Student Knowledge and Skills at Exit				
	Identification of Student Needs, Goals, & Interests				
		Student Retention and Withdrawal			
		Employer Satisfaction			
		Placement Rates and Employment Success			
			Course Completion		

The following criteria are being worked on by state committees and will be implemented as they are ready.

- Student Completion & Graduation Rates
- Student Achievement of Educational Goals
- Identification of Student Functional Skills at Entry
- Pass Rates/Scores of Licensure Exams
- Student Satisfaction

ALIGNMENT OF LTC MODEL TO WTCS MODEL

The following table shows the relationship between the WTCS Institutional Effectiveness Model and the LTC Student Academic Achievement Model. This can help to link current assessment efforts started under the LTC Student Academic Achievement plan to the WTCS Institutional Effectiveness Model. The key to the LTC core indicators appears after the matrix.

WTCS Institutional Effectiveness Model LTC Student Academic Achievement Model Matrix										
Core Indicator	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**
STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND SATISFACTION										
Identification of Student Needs, Goals and Interests				•						
Identification of Student Functional Skills at Entry				•			•			
Course Completion					•					
Student Grades										
Student Satisfaction with Courses, Programs, and Services				•		•				•
Student Retention/Withdrawal Rates				•						

Student Completion and Graduation Rates				•						
Student Achievement of Educational Goal(s)				•						
Student Knowledge and Skills at Exit						•				
Pass Rates/Scores of Licensure Exams						•				
Placement Rates/Employment Success	•					•				
EMPLOYER SATISFACTION										
Employer Satisfaction with Graduates' Work Skills/Performance	•									
ORGANIZATIONAL QUALITY										
Achievement of Institutional Goals and Standards							•	•	•	•
Organizational Climate									•	
PUBLIC PERCEPTION AND SATISFACTION										

Articulation and Linkages with External Organizations		•								
Identification of Customer Needs and Expectations			•				•			•
Public Satisfaction			•							•

• Indicates a relationship between the WTCS Institutional Effectiveness Model and the LTC Student Academic Achievement Model.

LTC Student Academic Achievement Model

Quality of Employer Satisfaction

1. Employers' satisfaction of graduates skills.
2. District employers' support of LTC time, expertise, dollars, and personal involvement.
3. Employers' satisfaction with LTC training and scheduling needs of employers.

Quality of Instruction

4. LTC provides occupational competency programming that is timely and flexible to meet the student needs.
5. LTC's support services to instructors are satisfactory for providing quality occupational programs and services.
6. LTC's curriculum provides the student with skills relevant to the occupation and satisfaction of the employer.
7. LTC's support services to students are satisfactory for all ages and multi-cultural groups.

Quality of Staff

8. LTC validates the quality/certification of staff.
9. LTC provides sufficient professional development opportunities and funding to maintain quality staff.
10. LTC staff are customer focused.

ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS

The following table identifies assessment efforts that are currently in place and who is responsible.

Core Indicator	Effort	Responsibility
Student Achievement And Satisfaction		
Identification of Student Needs Goals and Interests	ASSET Test	Vocational Assessment
	Vocational Assessment Process	Vocational Assessment
	Admission Interview	Center Support Services
Identification of Student Functional Skills at Entry	ASSET Test	Vocational Assessment
	Assessment: TABE, WRAT, Nelson-Denny	GOAL Instructors
Course Completion	Test	GOAL Instructors
	Documentation of skills to match course competencies	GOAL Instructors
	Client Reporting	Instructional Staff
Student Grades	Pass or Incomplete	GOAL Instructors
	Grade Reports	Instructional Staff
Student Satisfaction with Courses, Programs, and Services	Continuous Improvement Feedback Form	GOAL Instructors
	Seminar Survey	Business & Industry Services
	ABE/GED Feedback form	Instructional Staff
	ESL Conferences	Instructional Staff
Student Retention/Withdrawal Rates	Examination of locator list to identify drops and withdrawals	GOAL Instructors
	Personal phone contacts	GOAL Instructors

	Advancement to higher level course in program	GOAL Instructors
	Number of students returning to program	GOAL Instructors
	Enrollment follow-up	Enrollment office
Student Completion and Graduation Rates	High school completion credentials; GED, HSED, High School Diploma	GOAL Instructors
	Program entry	GOAL Instructors
	Initial and continued employment data on client reporting form	GOAL Instructors
	Client reporting	Instructional Staff
Student Achievement of Educational Goals	Track progress of goal attainment	GOAL Instructors
Student Knowledge and Skills at Exit	Standardized test score gains	GOAL Instructors
	Competency based performance	GOAL Instructors
	Instructor (program/course) feedback	GOAL Instructors
	Student course of study	Instructional Staff
Pass Rates/Scores of Licensure Exams	Licensure Passed	Deans
Placement Rates/Employment Success	Placement reports	Placement
	Six month follow-up	Placement
Employer Satisfaction		
Employer Satisfaction with Graduates	Employer follow-up	Placement
	Employer survey	Placement
Organizational Quality		

Achievement of Institutional Goals and Standards	Synergistic planning progress checks	Executive Committee
	Annual planning	Managers
Organizational Climate	Radar chart	In-service committee
Public Perception and Satisfaction		
Articulation and Linkages with External Organizations	38.14 contracts	Business and Industry Services
	High School contracts	School to Work
	Articulation agreements	Student Services
Identification of Customer Needs and Expectations		
Public Satisfaction		

DATA COLLECTION STANDARDS

The following standards have been identified to guide those people responsible for collecting data. It is expected that the standards and questions be incorporated into the documentation of the related processes and be available to staff through the research department.

Standards

- What
- Definition
- Source
- Screening Standard
- When measured

Questions

- What measurable improvement is expected?
- What activities, processes, and decisions are needed?
- What timeliness are planned?
- Who needs to be involved at which stage?
- What resources are needed?